



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/934,320

08/21/2001

Craig S. Calvert

PM 99.061

7470

7590

03/12/2008

Keith A. Bell  
ExxonMobil Upstream Research Company  
P.O. Box 2189  
Houston, TX 77252-2189

EXAMINER

SAXENA, AKASH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2128

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/12/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING  
2  
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
4

5  
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
7 AND INTERFERENCES  
8

9  
10 *Ex parte* CRAIG S. CALVERT, GLEN W. BISHOP,  
11 YUAN-ZHE MA, TINGTING YAO,  
12 J. LINCOLN FOREMAN, KEITH B. SULLIVAN,  
13 DWIGHT C. DAWSON, and THOMAS A. JONES  
14

15  
16 Appeal 2008-0483  
17 Application 09/934,320  
18 Technology Center 2100  
19

20  
21 Oral Hearing Held: February 19, 2008  
22

23  
24 Before LANCE LEONARD BARRY, HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, and  
25 STEPHEN C. SIU, *Administrative Patent Judges*.  
26

27 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS:  
28

29 MATTHEW T. SHANLEY, ESQ.  
30 ExxonMobil Upstream Research Company  
31 P.O. Box 2189  
32 Houston, Texas 77252-2189  
33

34 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday,  
35 February 19, 2008, commencing at 1:37 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and  
36 Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor, Hearing Room A,  
37 Alexandria, Virginia, before Kevin Carr, Notary Public.  
38

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MS. BOBO-ALLEN: Calendar Number 32, Appeal Number  
3 20080483.

4 JUDGE BARRY: Good morning, counsel.

5 MR. SHANLEY: Good afternoon, Your Honors.

6 JUDGE BARRY: We have about 20 minutes. We'll set the time  
7 whenever you're ready.

8 MR. SHANLEY: Okay. My name is Matt Shanley. I'm a corporate  
9 patent counsel with ExxonMobil's Upstream Research Company. It's the  
10 real party in interest in the present case. I want to thank you for allowing me  
11 the time and the opportunity to present the case today. Before I get started,  
12 is there any particular question or area that you would like me to focus on  
13 rather than just jumping into the sort of presentation that I had in mind.

14 JUDGE BARRY: Yes, counsel. The rules 4137C(1) requires that the  
15 summary of the invention in the brief references the figures by reference  
16 character and helps us more quickly identify the invention. And that wasn't  
17 done here. There were just referenced figures in general.

18 MR. SHANLEY: And they didn't have element numbers, you mean.  
19 Is that what you're saying?

20 JUDGE BARRY: Exactly. So, if you could go ahead and do that for  
21 us, that would be a help.

22 MR. SHANLEY: Sure.

23 JUDGE BARRY: For instance, in claim 1, the first two elements are  
24 mapped against "see figures 2, 3 and 5a," which isn't a lot of specificity.

1 MR. SHANLEY: And it's a broad range of figures too. Let me  
2 answer your question and if it's not sufficient I'll follow-up. But, perhaps I  
3 can do it this way. Figures 1, 2 and 3 show some aspects, and what I can do  
4 is walk you through claim 1 and show you generally what's going on here.

5 JUDGE BARRY: Claim 1 and then claim 2.

6 MR. SHANLEY: And if that doesn't sufficiently point it out, please  
7 tackle me and let me know. Well, I'll use claim 1 as the example here. So  
8 we have a method for constructing three-dimensional, geologic model of the  
9 subsurface earth volume. The first step in doing this is generating an initial  
10 frequency pass-band model of the sub-surface earth volume for at least one  
11 frequency past-band.

12 Now, figure 1 is really only useful in that it just demonstrates what we  
13 mean by a frequency pass-band. And this might be something that you  
14 might do in telecommunications, but you have spectra that show up at a low  
15 frequency pass-band, sort of a mid-range here, which corresponds to the  
16 seismic range that we deal with and then an upper range here that's shown.

17 But what we're doing when we say generating an initial frequency  
18 pass-band model, and the word model I think is particularly important here,  
19 is if you go to figure 2 now, we have examples of two models that are here.  
20 The first one is a low frequency pass-band model. And this happens to be of  
21 a particular rock property. In this case, it's a model of shale fraction for the  
22 earth at that position. Now we have a high frequency pass-band model of  
23 the same property, again, shale fraction.

24 But there are two discrete models that we have here and those are  
25 models that can have the one thing that's a common denominator for them.  
26 They might rely on seismic spectrum in order to be formed, but the result is

1 that you have an actual rock property that's associated with a volume within  
2 the sub-surface. So that's the first step there.

3 JUDGE BARRY: So what would be an initial frequency pass-band  
4 model?

5 MR. SHANLEY: It could be either one of those two would be an  
6 initial one. And, in fact, let me just briefly, in step B we have assigning  
7 values for at least one rock property in each initial frequency pass-band  
8 model. And what you have here, that would be the shell fraction that we're  
9 dealing with. So we would apply or assign a shell fraction for each one of  
10 these models to therefore model that rock property.

11 C is the next, I would say, important step, particularly in light of the  
12 rejections that we're facing here. It's the combining, the initial frequency  
13 pass-band models. And, what we have here is the example, looking at figure  
14 2 again, would be the low frequency pass-band model and a high frequency  
15 pass-band model to form an initial complete, three-dimensional, geological  
16 model of the sub-surface earth volume.

17 So, figure 2, again, I think probably best graphically shows what we're  
18 doing here. Figure 3, that step would correspond to 114 on figure 3.

19 JUDGE BARRY: Okay. And it's figure 2?

20 MR. SHANLEY: Generally, there.

21 JUDGE BARRY: Figure 2 corresponds to the addition?

22 MR. SHANLEY: Figure 2 would visually show the fact that you're  
23 taking the two models that you're starting with the combine. The output  
24 would be 5a would show the process step of 210, and that's just combining  
25 the initial frequency models.

26 JUDGE BARRY: Okay.

1           MR. SHANLEY: So, let me clarify again. So we start with the low  
2 frequency pass-band models, let's say the first of the models that we're  
3 combining. We have a mid frequency that's listed in here, and a high  
4 frequency. So there's three potential ones that are being combined. And the  
5 lower right-hand corner of the four screen shots that you have is the result.  
6 That's the complete model of shell fraction.

7           But an important thing to take away from each one of these is that  
8 each one of the three screen shots to the upper left, where the low frequency,  
9 mid-frequency and high frequency, they're not just data volumes, but they're  
10 actually models at this point, so they actually have the rock properties  
11 associated with them. So, independently, the low frequency pass-band  
12 model is a model of shale fraction at that frequency. The mid-frequency is a  
13 model of shale fraction at that frequency and so on. You then sum those  
14 three or combine those three together.

15           It's really a simple summation if you're dealing with low, medium and  
16 high that don't overlap. If there's some overlapping, then we discuss that  
17 there's some additional things that you might do as far as weighting each one  
18 of the models. But the combination is graphically represented by that lower  
19 right-hand corner screen shot.

20           JUDGE BARRY: Okay, and elements A and B? Where would those  
21 correspond to in Figure 3?

22           MR. SHANLEY: Elements A and D?

23           JUDGE BARRY: A and B.

24           MR. SHANLEY: Well, the generating of it would be your output that  
25 you would have. You know, the low frequency pass down model?

26           JUDGE BARRY: No. In figure 3?

1 MR. SHANLEY: Oh, on figure 3. I'm sorry. Well, figure 3 shows  
2 sort of a flow of it, but we have a combination of generating and really  
3 assigning the two of these. So A and B would really be shown in 111 more  
4 than anything.

5 JUDGE BARRY: Okay.

6 MR. SHANLEY: And then if you really want the discrete process,  
7 the steps themselves are better shown in 5A, but that's just a flow chart, so.

8 JUDGE BARRY: Okay, and then step D?

9 MR. SHANLEY: Step D is this optimization process, so if we go  
10 back up to step C and the output that we had was this combined model of  
11 rock property, we now optimize it, and optimization, the process that's  
12 described here is perturbing the rock property value.

13 So what you oftentimes you have this shale fraction that we have in  
14 figure 2. You will then go back. The idea is to compare almost an empirical  
15 data set or perhaps an observed data set with calculated results and you're  
16 going to tweak one of the variables here, and then go back and iterate and  
17 see whether not the results match. And so you intentionally do this until you  
18 get a match that's so close that it's desirable, and now you've optimized this  
19 process.

20 So, graphically, that's not necessarily shown in figure 2. It's because  
21 it's really screen shots of the actual model, but that can happen in several  
22 ways, process, Step D.

23 JUDGE BARRY: Is it shown in any of the figures, figure 3?

24 MR. SHANLEY: Well, as far as showing, it would have to be more  
25 of a result.

1 JUDGE BARRY: Well, I don't mean showing it. I mean one of its  
2 characters.

3 MR. SHANLEY: Yeah, figure 4 is directed at the idea of perturbing  
4 values.

5 JUDGE BARRY: Okay.

6 MR. SHANLEY: It's a simplified version, and as far as  
7 corresponding, I could point to additional paragraphs in the specification if I  
8 had my hands on it too.

9 JUDGE BARRY: Well, it's good to claim 18 then, the way you've got  
10 it claimed?

11 MR. SHANLEY: All right. Okay. So we have the method for  
12 constructing, again, a three-dimensional geological model. We have  
13 specifying the initial geologic architecture to define the limits of the model;  
14 and, so, that's not going to be shown graphically as far as specifying them,  
15 but really, A, you specify an initial geological architecture, creating a three-  
16 dimensional array of contiguous model blocks to represent all portions of the  
17 volume. The result is each one of the screen shots you see in figure 2, so it's  
18 specifying and creating the array is more difficult thing to show. But the  
19 results are each one of those models, the low I and mid-frequency, each one  
20 being their own model.

21 Again, when we get down to step D, which is combining the models  
22 and then that's similar to claim 1 up above, E, F and G, you're dealing with  
23 specifying training criteria for the initial model, calculating the statistics,  
24 describe the characteristics of these rock property values and calculating the  
25 initial objective function, again perturbing, calculating the objective



1 function. I am going to run through each one of these, then sum them all  
2 together for you.

3 Retain the perturbed rock property values and the new tentative  
4 objective function. And then we have this repeating steps. This is the  
5 iteration I am talking about. Each one of those would be shown in figure 3,  
6 sort of expands and you consider that an iterative loop and it's sort of at the  
7 center of the figure, 114, 116, 118, 112. You have sort of that process that's  
8 going on. Figure 4 talks about perturbation of the values.

9 Figure 5 is more generic to the model as a whole, but you have figure  
10 5B gets them to more granular with respect to the details of claim 18 there,  
11 more specifically, steps E through J, and outputting the final, complete,  
12 geologic model to file. It would be very similar to what you see on figure 2,  
13 the lower right-hand corner, but it may be slightly different if it's been  
14 optimized.

15 So those would be each element of those. Does that sufficiently  
16 answer what you were looking for?

17 JUDGE BARRY: Yes.

18 MR. SHANLEY: Okay. And since we've run through the claim here,  
19 I can direct you to, with looking at maybe figure 2 in our application and  
20 then I'll refer to figure 8A of the primary reference that the Office has relied  
21 upon. It ends in '759. It's the Etgen reference. I believe it's also repeated in  
22 the examiner's answer and a copy of the same screen shot.

23 JUDGE BARRY: The examiner seems to rely on figure 3A, not — as  
24 opposed to figure 8A, doesn't he?

25 MR. SHANLEY: I'll pull that one out as well, but we'll keep 3A and  
26 8A side-by-side. And 8A adds a little bit more, I think, visually to show

1 what's going on. And, most importantly, it shows what is meant by a  
2 velocity model. And so, you are correct, yeah. 3A is what was shown in the  
3 examiner's answer.

4 JUDGE BARRY: Right. The examiner reproduces 3A and 3B in his  
5 answer. So it's probably one that we should try to distinguish.

6 MR. SHANLEY: We'll stick to 3A and I'll reference on the 8A just to  
7 show visually what in fact we can start there. We have in 8A the only  
8 reason I really wanted to bring that up was to show what a velocity model is.  
9 In this case, it's a three-dimensional representation of the earth's sub-  
10 surface.

11 You have x-y coordinates, so you're looking at the earth down. So  
12 you're horizontal components, and then you have a depth component  
13 heading or the z-axis that we have. The property that's modeled in that  
14 model is velocity, so it's as the name states. It's a velocity, so it's as the  
15 name states as a velocity model. In contrast, and perhaps it might be the  
16 source of some confusion during the prosecution here was that we are  
17 dealing with a frequency pass-band model, and it appears that the office may  
18 be equating the fact that we say frequency pass-band model, that the model  
19 is modeling frequency pass-band, but that's not the case.

20 The frequency pass-band is a way that the data is looked at. In this  
21 case, in figure 2, shale fraction is the property that's actually modeled here.  
22 A frequency pass-band model is a way of modeling shale fracture, and so  
23 you can have a different story told about shale fraction, depending on which  
24 one of these frequency pass-band models you select. And so the Office has  
25 equated the velocity model.

1 JUDGE BARRY: Counsel, you should refer to what the examiner has  
2 done rather than the Office.

3 MR. SHANLEY: Well, I'm sorry, yeah, the examiner. The examiner  
4 has equated the velocity model, and I think more particularly in the  
5 examiner's answer he clarifies that you start with a velocity model. The  
6 property that is assigned, which would correspond to our step B in claim 1 is  
7 velocity in the examiner's velocity model. Then the next step is we have this  
8 process of combining models together. What the examiner has equated in  
9 figure 3A, and visually you would look at on the right-hand side. I guess it  
10 does have. It has an x, y and now a t component, which is the time.

11 You could either have x- y time, or x-y depth, either one, but it would  
12 both be a three-dimensional view of this. But what the Etgen reference then  
13 does is it does a three-dimensional Fourier transform here. In some of these  
14 other embodiments it does 2D and 1D, etcetera. One might say that you  
15 have a block that starting with in the upper right-hand corner is an off-set  
16 volume at this point. So on the left-hand side of figure thread, you actually  
17 started with a model of a rock property. And what you're doing in the  
18 process of this technique of migration is you are now down to just the data  
19 set. It is no longer an actual model of properties at this point.

20 And that's best demonstrated if you go down to the next step, the 3D  
21 Fourier transform produces. You now see what the spectrum has been  
22 reduced to. You have coordinates, x and y, but now you have w or  
23 frequency becomes now the z component that you have. And so you've lost  
24 that third spatial component that we have, and you are now in a different  
25 domain. And the interesting thing about, what the real sort of disagreement  
26 that we've had between the examiner and us is whether or not these

1 frequency slices, and then the recombination of these, can be equated to  
2 what we are doing here with combination of models. And what you see over  
3 and over in the briefs is that we're saying that frequency slices by themselves  
4 are not models.

5 JUDGE BARRY: Where do you see that in the brief, counsel?

6 MR. SHANLEY: Sure.

7 JUDGE BARRY: I certainly see "distinguishing frequency model  
8 from the velocity model." Of course, the examiner admits they are not the  
9 same.

10 MR. SHANLEY: And I think in the examiner's answer is where we  
11 get closer to clarification. Let me refer to that.

12 JUDGE BARRY: And if the examiner's answer, which was October  
13 20th of '06, on page 4 regarding claim 1, when the examiner is  
14 characterizing the Etgen reference, it talks about the step of generating an  
15 initial frequency pass-band model of the sub-surface earth vine for at least  
16 one frequency pass-band, as taught by Etgen as at least one frequency slice,  
17 whereas multiple slices are disclosed.

18 JUDGE BARRY: Right. So, the examiner's position in figure 3A to  
19 say that middle slice, say, frequency slice  $\omega_n$  would be.

20 MR. SHANLEY: Well, actually, yeah, and two of them too. Because  
21 what you've done here is if you look up above, that complete volume has  
22 been broken up into individual slices and so he hasn't just had one. He has  
23 had two. And so at least structurally, it looks as if you're taking two discrete  
24 elements and then combining them as we state in claim C. And I am not  
25 disagreeing with them there. The issue becomes more to what a frequency

1 slice is at that point, and if you then look at each one of those slices, and I'll  
2 refer to Etgen itself.

3 JUDGE BARRY: Okay. That's what I wanted to get at.

4 Where does your brief address that specific point that a frequency  
5 slice is not a--

6 MR. SHANLEY: Okay. I'll refer to the reply brief we filed. And the  
7 second paragraph that we started with her and it states -- and I don't know if  
8 you would consider it to be conclusory -- but it's stating that the assignment  
9 of rock properties to a velocity model and the subsequent conversion of the  
10 velocity model into frequency slices corresponds to assigning values for at  
11 least one rock property at each initial pass-band model.

12 JUDGE BARRY: I'm really just trying to map them, counsel.

13 What page were they before?

14 MR. SHANLEY: I'm sorry, page 2.

15 JUDGE BARRY: Okay, page 2, paragraph?

16 MR. SHANLEY: Paragraph 2 is where we sort of repeat what the  
17 examiner said in frequency slices, and then we come down with appellants'  
18 method of frequency pass-band model is not a model of velocity or of  
19 frequency. Again, it is noted in the appeal brief it is a model of some  
20 property of the sub-surface that is limited in frequency band width. So in  
21 Etgen, the frequency slices represent amplitude data that is limited in  
22 frequency content but not velocity.

23 JUDGE BARRY: Okay. And you cite what part of Etgen?

24 MR. SHANLEY: Column 17, lines 28 through 63.

25 JUDGE BARRY: Okay, let's turn to that.

26 MR. SHANLEY: Okay, sure.

1 JUDGE BARRY: And where does Etgen, column 17, lines 28  
2 through 63, explain that, what the frequency slices represent amplitude data  
3 that is limited in frequency content?

4 MR. SHANLEY: Okay, 28 through 63, this is talking about two  
5 things here. The first is the velocity model, itself, and how it is layered.

6 JUDGE BARRY: Right.

7 MR. SHANLEY: Yeah, and also, it's the second paragraph in that  
8 same citation. So we have those discussions here and in general be in terms  
9 of a layered model. And it might be confusing on how that was cited in the  
10 reply brief too, but that's probably better emphasizing the fact that the  
11 frequency slices represent amplitude data that is limited in frequency  
12 content, not velocity.

13 And, really, what that citation positively states is that it is limited in  
14 velocity. So, perhaps, that is not a direct corollary to what we've written in  
15 there in the reply brief, but what Etgen positively states there is that a  
16 velocity model contains constant velocity at each one of its blocks. So  
17 perhaps it's an inference there that draws or relates. It's not really a direct  
18 cite, I guess.

19 JUDGE BARRY: The paragraph more specifically teach that velocity  
20 is limited in the velocity model?

21 MR. SHANLEY: Well, because that's what a velocity model is. It's  
22 looking at just velocity in that case; and, really, I think getting to your point  
23 about where we talk about frequency slices, it's discussed in more detail at  
24 other portions within this as well. It's not within 28 or 63, though. It doesn't  
25 really get to just frequency slices. I can point to that though.

26 JUDGE BARRY: Well, if it was in your brief.

1 MR. SHANLEY: Are we out of time?

2 JUDGE BARRY: Yeah. Was it in your brief? If there's somewhere  
3 in your brief that you can point to and we can consider it, but we are bound  
4 to only what was argued in the briefs.

5 MR. SHANLEY: Okay.

6 JUDGE BARRY: And I thought your reply brief did get to an attempt  
7 to more specifically address the examiner's position, probably because the  
8 answer got through his position more specifically. But I, too, counsel, had  
9 that problem. I didn't see column 17, lines 28 through 63, teaching what you  
10 cited it here for.

11 MR. SHANLEY: Well, okay, and the follow-up to that was the next  
12 paragraph down as far as frequency slices, though. And we have Etgen then  
13 that then deals with there's two citations. You have column 5, line 40,  
14 column 7, line 35.

15 JUDGE BARRY: Where is that in your brief?

16 MR. SHANLEY: In Etgen. It's on page 3, the citation there.

17 So we expand on some of the additional citations in Etgen that deal  
18 with frequency slices here and how they equate really following that process  
19 in figure 3A.

20 JUDGE BARRY: Right. Column 5, line 40 through column 7, line  
21 30, basically being an overview of the summary of the invention.

22 MR. SHANLEY: Right, and to that end, with what you have in that  
23 frequency in frequency slices is you have this x-y component, or the kx-ky.  
24 But when you do those frequency slices, what you are left with are not  
25 individual rock properties that are in those slices. And now you are left

1 with transform coefficients, because you are not dealing with a model at that  
2 point. You are dealing with a data volume that's been broken up.

3 So the contrast to an actual model that has a physical rock property,  
4 the slices that you are dealing with here, their so-called property would be  
5 transformed coefficients at that point, which aid the ability to then output a  
6 composite data spectrum. But if you will see at the end of figure 3A, they're  
7 talking about a migration technique, and a model is not physically output  
8 here. In order to take this next step, you would have to invert that Fourier  
9 transform back in order to create an actual volume or a model at that point.

10 So our main position here with respect to the examiner's rejection is  
11 that the frequency slices here themselves don't model rock property. What  
12 they actually contain are transfer coefficients. What we show in ours is that  
13 it's an actual physical rock property.

14 Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

15 JUDGE BARRY: You're welcome.

16 [The hearing was concluded at 1:59 p.m.]

17 \* \* \* \* \*